



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,721	02/16/2005	Josef Ehrenfreund	70035	8404
26748	7590	07/17/2008	EXAMINER	
SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION , INC.			CHUNG, SUSANNAH LEE	
PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT				
410 SWING ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GREENSBORO, NC 27409			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/524,721	EHRENFREUND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUSANNAH CHUNG	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-5 and 8 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-5, 8 and 9 are pending in the instant application. Claims 6-7 are canceled.

Response to Non-Final Office Action

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's response and amendment of the claims filed on 5/23/08.

Claims 1-5 and 8 are directed to an allowable product. Pursuant to the procedures set forth in MPEP § 821.04(B), claim 9, directed to the process of making or using an allowable product, previously withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement, mailed on 10/3/2007 is hereby rejoined and fully examined for patentability under 37 CFR 1.104.

Because all claims previously withdrawn from consideration under 37 CFR 1.142 have been rejoined, **the restriction requirement as set forth in the Office action mailed on 10/3/2007 is hereby withdrawn**. In view of the withdrawal of the restriction requirement as to the rejoined inventions, applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Once the restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for the reasons described below.

As stated in MPEP 2164.01(a), “there are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is “undue.”

The factors to be considered when determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, were described in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) as:

1. the nature of the invention;
2. the breadth of the claims;
3. the state of the prior art;
4. the relative skill of those in the art;
5. the predictability or unpredictability of the art;
6. the amount of direction or guidance presented [by the inventor];
7. the presence or absence of working examples; and
8. the quantity of experimentation necessary [to make and/or use the invention].

The eight Wands factors are applied to Claim 9 of the present invention below:

(1) The Nature of the Invention

Claim 9 is directed to

Claim 9. (Previously presented): A method of controlling or preventing infestation of cultivated plants by phytopathogenic microorganisms by application of a compound of formula (I) according to claim 1, to plants, to parts thereof or the locus thereof.

(2) The Breadth of the claims

Claim 9 will be given its broadest reasonable interpretation. The applicable rule for interpreting the claims is that “each claim must be separately analyzed and given its broadest reasonable interpretation in light of and consistent with the written description.” See MPEP 2163(II)(1), citing In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1053-1054; 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In view of this rule, Claim 9 which is directed to controlling and preventing infestations of cultivated plants by phytopathogenic microorganisms by application of a compound of formula (I) will be interpreted to treat any infestation by a phytopathogenic microorganism.

(3) The state of the prior art

The state of the art of phytopathogenic microorganisms is that it encompasses any organism that is pathogenic or capable of causing a disease to a plant. This encompasses a wide range of pathogens that could adversely affect cultivated plants. There are fungal, oomycete, protozoa, bacterial, viral, parasitic nematodes, abiotic disorders, and more. Also, within each category of genus pathogens there are specific types of pathogens. For example, significant fungal plant pathogens include *Fusarium*, *Thielaviopsis*, *Verticillium*, and *Magnaporthe grisea*.

The instantly claimed compounds are 1,2,3-triazole compounds. These class of compounds have not been shown to be effective in treating all infestations caused by any phytopathogenic microorganism.

The current state of the art includes the use of pyrazole-thiocynate compounds for the treatment of two dermatophytes: *Epidermophyton floccosum* and *Trichophyton rubrum*. The treatment of this fungi by the pyrazole-thiocynate compound can be seen in Romagnoli et al., *Mycopathologia*, Vol. 153, pp. 129-132, 2001, especially page 129. Romagnoli provides inhibition rate data after seven days of treatment with the compounds on the fungi. (See page 131.) The effects of the treatment with the compounds was tested at different doses and the different rates reported.

(4) The relative skill of those in the art

The level of skill in the art (pharmaceutical chemists, physicians) would be high.

(5) The predictability or unpredictability of the art

It is noted that this art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability in the factors involved. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839. Therefore, the more unpredictable an area, the more specific enablement is needed in order to satisfy the statute. Added to the unpredictability of the art itself is the question whether a visual showing of a decrease in disease incidence of a few types of phytopathogens could reliably and predictably be applied to the treatment and prevention of all types of infestations caused by phytopathogenic microorganisms. There is no absolute predictability, even in view of the high level of skill in the art.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented (by the inventor)

The specification in the present invention discloses that the instantly claimed compounds decreased the “disease incidence” of the following phytopathogens: *Puccinia recondita*, *Podosphaera leucotricha*, *Venturia inaequalis*, *Erysiphe graminis*, *Botrytis cinerea*, *Septoria nodorum*, *Helminthosporium teres*, *Altemaria solani*, and *Uncinula necator*. (See specification pages 72-74.) The guidance provided by the inventor is unclear. What does decreasing disease incidence entail. The details of the experiment were not disclosed in the instant application. For example, the following questions are raised: what were the same sizes, what does were used, what was the rate of inhibition and what was the population size measured?

(7) The presence or absence of working examples

The specification states that the level of disease is decreased by the application of the instantly claimed compounds, however there are no working examples such as the ones found in the Romagnoli journal showing data such as the inhibition rate or whether various doses were tried.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary (to make and/or use the invention)

Given the absence of direction or guidance (or working examples) in the specification for the role of the instantly claimed compounds in the treatment and prevention of all infestations by any phytopathogen, it would cause a skilled artisan an undue amount of experimentation to practice this invention to determine which patients with which diseases would benefit from which of the many claimed compounds within the scope of the invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

The instant breadth of the claim is broader than the disclosure. The specification, prior art or instant disclosure does not provide support for this.

Objections

The title of the instant application "Chemical Compounds" is objected to and should be replaced with a more descriptive title such as 1,2,3-triazole Chemical Compounds.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susannah Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-6098. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/REI-TSANG SHIAO /
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626

Susannah Chung, July 16, 2008